

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/589,675	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MURRAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ahmed M. Farah	<b>Art Unit</b> 3735	

**All Participants:**

(1) Ahmed M. Farah.

(2) Peter J. Su (Reg. No. 43,939).

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 6 January 2006

**Time:** 11:10 AM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 6, 10, 15, and 33

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The claim language of claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 33, was discussed. In particular, the recitation "fluorescent element being adapted to deliver ..." in the claims was discussed. The examiner asserted that this recitation is an intended use of the device, and suggested to the applicants' representative to amend the claim language in order to positively recite the function of the fluorescent element. Applicants' representative has agreed to amend the claims and authorized the examiner to make agreed changes by Examiner's Amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance. However, a search update, which is required for allowable subject matter in patent applications, revealed/produced the prior art used described in the attached Office Action. The Examiner sincerely apologizes to the applicants and applicants' representative for any inconvenience this may have caused..